

## HGAB MEETING MINUTES

May 8, 2006

**In attendance:**

Doug Cochran, Chair  
Dean Logan  
Kristina Swanson  
Thad Duvall  
Katie Blinn  
Lori Guerrero, Staff  
Brenda Landers, Staff

**Audience:**

Sheryl Moss  
Bill Fieber  
Tami Davis  
Erika Aust  
Several County Auditors and County Staff

Doug Cochran called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm. Lori asked the board to review the January 23, 2006 Board Minutes. Dean moved and Thad Seconded a motion to approve the minutes. It was noted that Katie Blinn was representing Nick Handy in the meeting.

### **Grant Review of Priority One**

**Franklin** - \$35,000 - This grant request is an addendum to their existing punch card contract. It includes costs associated with a second year of training and travel for 2007, floor mats, workstation for server, and security cabinets.

Thad asked about whether or not the original contract included training costs. It was noted that the contract with Sequoia did not include training because the vendor did not want to travel to such a small county. No motion made.

**Adams** – \$8,500 - This grant request is for the purchase of two Disability Access Units (DAU's). The county requested funding for one, but staff encouraged the county to purchase two. This grant is for additional costs associated with the 2<sup>nd</sup> DAU and tabulation cost overruns. No motion made.

**Kittitas** – \$16,600 - This grant request is for 2006 and 2007 maintenance fees for the county DAU's. The original grant request for the purchase of DAU's did not include maintenance fees. No motion made.

**Kittitas** - \$17,000 - This grant request is for 2006 and 2007 maintenance fees for the county voter registration system. The original grant request for the voter registration system did not include maintenance fees. No motion made.

**Klickitat** – \$900 - This grant request is for one additional scanner to be used with the voter registration system. No motion made.

**San Juan** - \$2,229.80 - This grant request is for overtime wages associated with the implementation of the voter registration system. The county chose to have a staff person implement the system. A grant request for reimbursement of the wages was previously submitted and denied since the county would have paid the wages regardless. This request is for the overtime costs only. Dean asked OSOS staff to ensure that the county had not billed out these costs. If so, the grant would not be funded.

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the six (6) priority one grant requests as submitted and discussed. All approved.
--

### **Print Ready Materials**

Lori explained that the Elections Outreach Division provided counties with the opportunity to print templates of brochures and the FAQ booklet. Division staff worked directly with counties on developing grant requests and developing estimates. Items included were:

1. 100 Most Frequently Asked Questions Booklet
2. Voting Rights and Procedures for People with Disabilities brochure
3. Ethnic Minority Voting Rights Information and Clarification Brochure
4. Military Voting Procedures
5. Restoration of Voting Rights (felons)
6. Voter Registration Guidelines
7. Getting Your Information to Voters

**Chelan** – \$8,200 - This grant request is for the full compliment of items. Skip noted that items will not be used for a targeted mailing to voters, but rather to have in stock. No motion made.

**Columbia** – \$5,400 - This grant request is for items number 1,2, 5, and 6. No motion made.

**Franklin** – \$97,500 - This grant request is for items number 1,2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, in both English and Spanish. The Board members were concerned about the large numbers they were requesting. Erika noted that the estimate may be high as well. No motion made.

Lori noted that staff can get revised numbers from the county and email the Board with the additional information. Dean noted that pointing out that it is too high [and asking staff to address it with the county] is sufficient for now. No motion made.

**King** – \$17,000 - This grant request is for an un-specified group of items, including both English and Chinese materials. No motion made.

**Pacific** – \$3,000 - This grant request is for the full compliment of items. No motion made.

**Spokane** – \$5,300 - This grant request is for the full compliment of items, including number 3 in Russian and English. Vicky noted that the items will be used in a targeted mailing, and that they are looking forward to the Russian language brochure. No motion made.

**Wahkiakum** - \$3,500 - This grant request is for items number 1, 2, and 6. No motion made.

**Yakima** – \$20,400 - This grant request is for the full compliment of items, in both English and Spanish. No motion made.

Thad moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the eight (8) counties, with the caveat that staff contact Franklin County and discuss the numbers in their request. All approved.

### **Print Ready Materials plus additional items**

**Klickitat** – \$42,000 - This grant request is a combined grant request of items number 1, 2, 4, and 6, in addition to the design of an online local voters pamphlet and auto-folders. Thad asked if the online voters pamphlet is part of VRDB phase II. Erika noted that while it is, this grant may be for set up which they will still have to do.

Dean moved and Katie seconded a motion to recommend approval for \$42,000, with the caveat that staff contact the County concerning the numbers of items being printed and the online voters pamphlet. All approved.

Discussion: It was noted after the motion was made that their original request was for \$62,000 and they had already reduced it to \$42,000. The final amount of the amendment will be \$42,000.

**Kitsap** - \$59,000 - This grant request is for two high-speed letter openers and the development and printing of a household educational mailing.

Katie moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Pend Oreille**- \$19,000 - This grant request is for items that will help the county establish an outreach and education program, including travel, materials and supplies, and printing and mailing of publications. In addition the request is for two ballot drop boxes. Their original request was for one but staff encouraged them to purchase two.

Thad moved and Katie seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Whatcom** – \$4,000 request / adjusted to \$2,043 - This grant request is for cost overruns associated with the production and mailing of a newsletter. Shirley Forslof was in attendance and noted that they wanted to revise the request amount down to \$2,043.

Dean moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request for \$2043. All approved.

**Spokane** – \$140,000 - This grant request is for the development and distribution of a local voters pamphlet for two years. Spokane is the one of the largest counties without a local voters pamphlet. The pamphlet will be combined with the OSOS pamphlet. The estimate came from the OSOS office. This is a pamphlet for the General Election only.

Kris moved and Dean seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

Discussion: Doug asked how it will be funded after the two years. Vicky noted that they will do a resolution and bill it out after that.

**Yakima** \$6,000 - This grant request is for the overtime portion of the salary for the HAVA funded Bilingual Outreach position. The original grant request for the position included overtime that was denied. The county re-submitted a request for the overtime with a justification statement. Thad noted that this position is important in Yakima County as they are in a unique situation as a Department of Justice County.

Thad moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Franklin** – \$51,936 – This grant request is for SOE software (Clarity Connect) that the county would use to create a new elections website. Lori noted that the HAVA Workgroup recommended that this grant request NOT be funded because it duplicates VRDB Phase II. Dean noted that it does include provisional ballots, which is required by HAVA. There was a discussion about the status of VRDB Phase II. Erika provided an update and Vicky talked about what will be provided at a county level.

Kris moved and Katie seconded a motion to accept the workgroup recommendation (not funded). All approved.

Discussion: Dean noted that if there is a portion of the program that provides for provisional ballot tracking he would recommend funding that portion. He would ask that Secretary Reed consider that. Thad noted that it could be a year before we get that functionality at the state level. Dean suggested that the county ask the vendor to isolate those costs.

**Columbia** – \$4,000 - This grant request is for the local development of an elections website. Currently the county does not have a website at all. Thad asked why the local effort cant be funded. Brenda explained that we can't pay to fund a site for the whole county – it has to be for elections only. In addition, there is a concern about whether the county has the staff to maintain it. And, finally, it is a duplication of VRDB Phase II.

Dean moved and Katie seconded a motion that the grant request not be funded, to be consistent with previous decisions. All approved.

**Jefferson** - \$1,900 – This grant request is for a projector and screen for outreach and training. Donna Eldridge noted that the laptop previously funded thru HAVA is set up to do presentations but they currently have to use a wall for display purposes. These two items will allow them to provide professional presentations.

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request All approved.

### **Renovations and More**

**Chelan** –\$289,800 – This grant request is for renovations of election space, in addition to costs associated with a ½ time outreach employee. Evelyn noted that the HART equipment takes up more room than what they have, and that the county seat is going to be the poll site. Currently elections on the second level and it is not ADA compliant. The commissioners are moving out of their offices on the first floor and elections will move into that area. The renovation will improve security and accommodate observers.

Evelyn added that the ½ time outreach employee is vital. Douglas County has been providing them assistance but they need their own outreach staff. Katie noted that HAVA funded work has to be for the voting age population. Evelyn noted that one of their target populations is high school seniors.

Lori noted that all renovations work, etc. is being forward to the Elections Assistance Commission (EAC) for approval. This will benefit the county by ensuring that no money will have to be paid back to the EAC. Thad noted that moving the location may eliminate the need for ADA work. Lori stressed that it is important to make sure that someone from the disability community make sure that the work is done to address the needs of the voters in the community.

Thad moved and Dean seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request, subject to EAC approval. All Approved.

Discussion: There was a concern voiced that if the grant was not expedited Chelan Elections could lose the space, due to space issues in the county overall. Lori requested that county staff submit an email request to OSOS with a deadline of the end of June, that can be forwarded to the EAC.

**Clallam** – \$12,100 – This grant request is for a basic remodel to accommodate ADA, and provide for more secure storage.

Kris moved and Katie seconded motion to recommend approval of the grant request, subject to EAC approval. All approved.

**Franklin** – \$113,000 - This grant request is for an office remodel to create more space for observers, in addition to the purchase of modular furnishings. Dean noted that there is a difference between remodel due to ADA or to accommodate new equipment and doing a remodel and purchasing all new equipment/furnishing. He voiced concern that new furnishings may not be a priority and will not improve elections.

Lori noted that in their application they talked about needing to improve workflow and improve security. The furnishings are meant to achieve those goals. Lori noted that the EAC will need to approve. Thad asked how the Board will find out about the EAC decisions. Lori said she would notify Board members as soon as she receives responses from the EAC.

Thad moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request, subject to EAC approval. All approved.

**Spokane** - \$49,000 – This grant request is for an office remodel. Vicky noted that this remodel will create a ballot tracking area, provide more secure work areas, in addition to new computers and equipment that are needed to administer a vote-by-mail election. Two essential items are tables and chairs. These are all new items – they are not replacing old ones.

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request, subject to EAC approval. All approved.

**Grays Harbor** – \$219,000 requested / revised to \$216,500 - This grant request is for the purchase of a modular building and necessary equipment that will be used for a new elections office and ballot processing center. Lori outlined the grant request and noted that no other space is available close by. The county is donating the land for the modular building, on the county campus. Lori noted that the Workgroup recommended removal of several items that were not related to the improvement of elections (microwave, etc.).

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request, based on work group recommendations, and subject to EAC approval. All approved.

### **King County Grant Requests**

Doug asked the OSOS staff to talk about the prior grant cycles and how much was awarded, etc. Katie noted that there were four \$5 million grant cycles, this being the fourth. The original process that was established noted that if over \$5 million in grant requests were submitted in one cycle, funds would be awarded on a competitive basis.

Katie also noted that we are fortunate that we have money left in the HAVA funds - other states do not. Doug asked OSOS staff to talk about funding set-asides or county distributions. Lori outlined the policy that was developed to distribute priority two funds, and how the policy addressed each county getting their share.

Doug noted that within the grants currently being reviewed, two of the fairly large King County grant requests did NOT receive funding recommendations. Katie noted that the OSOS reviewed each grant request individually and then weighed them. Dean asked whether or not the denial was based on the \$5 million cap or the substance of the grants? Katie noted that it was both. The HAVA workgroup looked at each grant and considered whether or not it would be funded if there

were unlimited dollars. The workgroup also weighed the amount of money King County received, or would receive, compared to their percent of Washington's voters.

Katie noted that the information was shared with Secretary Reed last week. The workgroups initial recommendation was to fund \$3.2 million to King County. Katie said that the OSOS favor capital investments over temporary outreach programs, etc. Secretary Reed is very supportive of King County's tabulators and ballot tracking needs and wanted to follow through with funding for those initiatives.

Katie also noted that there have been a large number of citizen groups, etc. who have looked into the King County Elections support, and noted that the King County Council has been very vocal about their support of elections. While the County may have made baby-steps [in terms of providing support], and while there has been a lot of talk about consultants and new facilities, it is important for the Council to start showing financial support. Since the Council has made a decision to go vote by mail they will need to take care of some of the costs. Secretary Reed supported funding King County at the \$4.2 million level which leaves \$8.9 million for the HAVA Maintenance Fund.

Doug noted that it is a difficult thing to get your mind around. Some counties have asked for large amounts of funding, and others small. We haven't made a line in the dirt that says that counties will receive priority two funding based on an allocation model. We have simply funded what is in front of us if it seems feasible. Katie agreed and said that when you look at priority two funding in terms of dollars-per-voter there is a huge flux. Sometimes small counties have larger costs per voter.

Doug noted that there have been times when a county has an existing program by may want improvements. However, those couldn't be funded through HAVA. Doug noted that King County may fall into that category. Dean noted that he currently has \$2 million in vote-by-mail grant requests' in front of the Council.

Dean noted that it is a simple equation. \$20 million was made available with few parameters put on it. He does not think that the requests are different than others - funding King County's requests will not leave other counties without the money they need or requested. He noted that grant requests on the table all connect to the recommendations made by the oversight groups. Dean also noted that the requests are in-line with the HAVA State Plan.

Thad moved and Kris seconded a motion to allow for grants over and above the \$5 million cap. All approved.

**King County - Ballot Accountability** - \$2,900,000 (\$2,700,000 recommended)

**King County - Tabulation Upgrade** - \$1,600,000 (\$1,500,000 recommended)

Thad asked why the HAVA Workgroup recommended only funding the two requests at about 90% versus 100%. Katie noted that it was a negotiating process between the HAVA Workgroup and Secretary Reed. Dean noted that he is not concerned about the slight adjustment in the amount and he will not ask the Board to consider the full amount.

Thad moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant requests for Ballot Tracking and Tabulation Upgrade, as recommended by the HAVA Workgroup. Dean abstained from voting. All approved.

## **King County - Voter Education - \$962,000**

Dean explained that most of this is a voter education and outreach campaign for moving to vote by mail, in addition to getting signature updates from voters. It also includes a video used internally and externally about the King County elections process. The video will be used with community groups as well as for training purposes.

Dean was asked to address each of the concerns noted by the HAVA Workgroup.

1. Concern that the educational video may duplicate the video produced by the state.  
*Response: The educational video is specific to King County processes. Thad noted that the video could not be duplicate if it is how Dean explained it.*
2. Concern about the overall cost of the project.  
*Response: Dean noted that the size of King County is the driver.*
3. Concern about candidate and initiative information.  
*Response: Dean cannot comment but agrees that it is duplicative of existing voters pamphlets. He suggest a caveat be added that states that this will not be funded.*
4. Concern about disability access voting equipment (DAVE) education.  
*Response: The current HAVA grant for the DAVE project is only being spent to develop a video for this fall and is geared towards training poll-workers. After the county goes vote by mail new education will need to be provided to voters.*
5. Concern over spending money to target all voters when the majority of King County voters are already absentee. Katie clarified that the major concern is the cost of air-time, etc.)  
*Response: Bob noted that the money spent here could help neighboring counties. He supported it.*

Thad moved and Kris seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. Dean abstained from voting. Three Board members approved and Katie voted no.

**King County - Software Suite/ SOE – \$1,040,000 –** This grant request is for software modules associated with:

- Clarity Training / Online Poll worker and election working training
- Clarity Connect / Election Management Software (including calendaring)

Board members asked Dean Logan to respond to the concerns raised by the HAVA Workgroup:

1. Concern was raised over the cost of the software.
2. Concern was raised over the effectiveness of using software to train staff and poll workers.  
*Response: Training is for election-workers that can be used far into the future, and will be combined with live training*
3. Concern was raised over the duplication of existing programs for display of election results, candidate information, personalized voter information/voter guide.  
*Response: The web-based portion of the request will be subtracted from the request.*

Thad noted that he has been searching for a similar product for use in his County. He has no question that the program will improve the election process. Kris asked if these items will be included in VRDB phase II. Katie responded no. Vicky Dalton and Bob Terwilliger noted that it might be a good idea to see if the OSOS can work on this at the state level.

Thad moved to table the discussion to accommodate Jefferson County staff who had to leave.

**Jefferson** - \$4,600 – This grant request is for a variable speed programmable folder.

Kris moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

***King County – SOE Software – continued***

Thad noted that grants for other counties have been approved with the broad description of improving elections - he believes that this will do that in King County.

***Thad moved to fund up to \$700,000, excluding web portions. Died for lack of a second.***

Kris noted that can we fund this request, and then ask SOE about serving the whole state, as many counties will be interested. She also noted that she thought counties had backed off [of submitting these types of requests] because of a motion made at the Board level. Dean noted that it is every counties responsibility to submit grants. Doug noted that Spokane and Clark went down a road [software and web improvements] and it was decided to tackle the work at the state level. This feels very similar.

Lori noted that the [maintenance] fund needs to be available for all 39 counties. In a few years there are going to be counties that are in deep financial need because of maintenance fees, etc. Dean noted that it is not right to make sure there is money left over for a maintenance fund at this point. The OSOS has funded laptops and chairs and we should be willing to fund larger projects for a large county. Lori noted that the program has evolved over time. Dean noted that you can't say that it has to be a fair share when you are funding a \$97,000 grant request for a small county to print brochures.

Doug noted that even though the Board's role is advisory, their decision could still be political. Thad noted that the money has been out there for a couple of years and there was no question in anyone's mind that they were competitive [grants]. Even with 4 grant cycles, it took many counties time to shake themselves free of the Governor's race to concentrate on grants. They have all had time to submit grants.

Vicky noted that in the 11 Eastern counties, 10 are small and poor. Some are struggling just to keep their doors open. Some Auditors are not able to attend meetings or come to conferences and don't have an idea of grants they could apply for because they aren't even aware. The smaller counties need to have at least one more opportunity to apply for things that could help them. Dean noted that he agrees, however, he's not asking to use up all the money. He is asking the Board to look at all requests fairly.

Evelyn Arnold said that King County's request has a spin-off for other counties. If SOE gets on Board [with King County], it could be that SOE gets established in Washington elections and then over time all counties could benefit.

Kris moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval up to \$700,000. Three voted yes and Katie voted no. Dean abstained.



Kris moved and Thad seconded a motion for the state to look into the SOE management software [calendaring] for all 39 counties. All approved.

**Ferry** - \$14,500 - This grant request is for mail processing equipment. Lori noted that Ferry County originally requested funds for a large Pitney Bowes system (similar to Grant County below), but then revised their request after speaking with Jefferson County about the equipment they purchased.

Kris moved and Dean seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Grant** – \$58,000 - This grant request is for a mail processing system. It was noted that this system is similar to the one approved for Pacific County.

Kris moved and Dean seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Okanogan** - \$45,600 – This grant request is for ballot boxes, envelope printer plus maintenance, and voter verifiable paper audit trail equipment.

Kris moved and Katie seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Mason** - \$5,000 - This grant request is for ballot drop boxes and vote-by-mail equipment and supplies.

Kris moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Snohomish** - \$400,000 – This grant request is for tabulation upgrade, ballot accountability system upgrade, and all associated equipment and software.

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. Katie was absent during the vote. All others approved.

**Spokane** - \$15,500 - This grant request is for ballot drop boxes for the county regional service centers and courthouse. Vicky noted concern that if the colleges wanted to add drop boxes on-campus they may need to purchase the drop boxes separately.

Kris moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Whatcom** – \$1,000 - This grant request is for materials needed to build a security cage.

Katie moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. All approved.

**Cowlitz** – \$4,200 - This grant request is for costs associated with additional secure storage.

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. Kris abstained. All approved.

**Douglas** - \$69,000 – This grant request is for the development and processing of an elections calendar geared toward college students.

Katie moved and Dean seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. Thad abstained. All approved.

### **Elections Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities**

**Cowlitz** - \$35,000 – This grant request is for the abatement of asbestos that was found when doing the work funded under the original EAID grant.

Dean moved and Thad seconded a motion to recommend approval of the grant request. Kris abstained. All approved.

### **Budget Summary**

Lori reviewed the budget summary and noted that \$20,000 is left in current EAID funds. The OSOS has applied for a new award of \$199,000. Thad asked about the certainty of the additional funding. It was noted that we do get it every year, but as of yet there has been no word from the EAC.

Lori noted that we should plan on holding a meeting in July to discuss priority one overruns.

Katie brought up the notion of developing the HAVA maintenance fund. She noted that we would like to relay to all auditors the future of HAVA funding at the June elections conference.

Dean noted that if we wait a little time we might get a better idea of how much money is really left. Kris asked if all counties have met the requirements of HAVA. OSOS staff said that the answer is yes, on paper, but in terms of receiving the equipment and training, etc. all counties are not ready to use their new machines.

Lori explained that there are certain spending limitations put on us until we meet all HAVA requirements. This refers to priority two spending only.

Lori noted that if the EAC comes back with the answer that maintenance fees for (16) counties can be paid for out of priority one, then there may be more money than we know.

There was a tentative meeting scheduled for July 11<sup>th</sup>, 1:00 pm in Olympia. The meeting agenda will include the maintenance fund and priority one cost overruns.

Meeting adjourned – at 4:42 pm.